

**Serial No.: 10/632,084
Response to Office Action Dated December 14, 2005
Amendment Dated July 24, 2006**

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

REMARKS

Receipt of the Office action of December 14, 2005 is hereby acknowledged. In that action the Examiner: 1) rejected claims 1-25 as allegedly anticipated by Toy (U.S. Pat. No. 4,314,350); 2) rejected claims 1, 10, 13, and 22 as allegedly anticipated by Kreitzer (U.S. Pat. No. 5,253,349); and 3) objected to claims 6, 9, and 20.

With this Response, Applicants amend claims 1, 6, 9-10, 13, 20, and 22-25. Applicants believe the pending claims are allowable over the art of record and respectfully request reconsideration.

I. AMENDMENTS TO THE SPECIFICATION

With respect to paragraphs [0001], [0016], [0023]-[0024], [0026]-[0031], and [0034]-[0035], Applicant presents a plurality of amendments to add serial numbers and/or patent numbers of related cases, and to correct grammatical shortcomings. No new matter is added.

II. RECORDATION OF SUBSTANCE OF EXAMINER INTERVIEW

The Applicants, by the undersigned Agent, held a telephonic interview with the Examiner on July 24, 2006. The general thrust of the principal arguments of the Applicants was that the Applicants have indeed complied with the requirements of 37 CFR 1.63(c) since the application data sheet does acknowledge the filing of a foreign application. The Examiner found this argument to be persuasive, and an agreement was reached to withdraw the statement regarding non-compliance with 37 CFR 1.63(c). Other pertinent matters discussed related to the manner of making a petition to revive an unintentionally abandoned application. During the course of the interview, there was no discussion related to prior art, specific claims, exhibits or demonstrations, or identification of the principal proposed amendments.

III. CLAIM OBJECTIONS

The Office action objects to claims 6, 9, and 20 for various informalities. Applicant amends claims 6, 9, and 20 to address these concerns. No new matter is added.

**Serial No.: 10/632,084
Response to Office Action Dated December 14, 2005
Amendment Dated July 24, 2006**

IV. ART-BASED REJECTIONS

A. Claim 1

Claim 1 stands rejected as allegedly anticipated by Toy. Applicants amend claim 1 to more clearly define over Toy's execution of the test and skip operation. The amendment finds support in the original specification at Paragraphs [0017]-[0020], [0027], and Claim 1.

Toy is directed to self-checking arithmetic unit. (Toy Title). In particular, Toy appears to disclose a system for detecting errors in an arithmetic logic unit (Toy Col. 2, lines 50-51) comprising a microsequencer (Toy Col. 2, lines 54-55), wherein error detection is done by performing identical operations on identical data and comparing the results (Toy Col. 3, lines 9-11), and wherein the microsequencer may execute a test and skip operation (Toy Col. 4, lines 18-22). Toy teaches that the test and skip operation is always executed for **each even address** (Toy Col. 4, lines 49-50). Thus, Toy teaches that **for each micro-instruction having an even micro-address, the test and skip microprogram operation is executed** (Toy Col 4, lines 40-50).

Claim 1, by contrast, specifically recites, "wherein said processor executes a test and skip instruction **when called within the plurality of instructions**". Applicants respectfully submit that Toy does not expressly or inherently teach such a system. Toy teaches execution of a test and skip operation at **each even address**. Toy is silent as to execution of the test and skip operation by way of a programmable instruction. Instead, Toy teaches that **for each instruction having an even address, the test and skip operation is always executed**. Therefore, Toy fails to expressly or inherently teach "wherein said processor executes a test and skip instruction **when called within the plurality of instructions**".

Claim 1 further stands rejected as allegedly anticipated by Kreitzer. Applicants amend claim 1 to more clearly define over Kreitzer's execution of the test and skip operation. The amendment finds support in the original specification at Paragraphs [0017]-[0020], [0027], and Claim 1.

Kreitzer is directed to decreasing processing time for type 1 dyadic instructions. (Kreitzer Title). In particular, Kreitzer appears to disclose a method and associated

**Serial No.: 10/632,084
Response to Office Action Dated December 14, 2005
Amendment Dated July 24, 2006**

circuitry for improving processing efficiency in computer systems by modifying the processing architecture associated with execution of type 1 dyadic instructions (Kreitzer Col. 1, lines 28-33) comprising a compare and skip operation for improving overall processing efficiency (Kreitzer Col. 3, lines 12-14 and Col. 1, lines 40-42). Kreitzer teaches that the compare and skip operation is executed if the hardware decoder determines that the instruction being processed is type 1 dyadic (Kreitzer Col. 3, lines 17-53). Thus, Kreitzer teaches execution of the compare and skip operation as **determined by the hardware decoder**.

Claim 1, by contrast, specifically recites, "wherein said processor executes a test and skip instruction **when called within the plurality of instructions**". Applicants respectfully submit that Kreitzer does not expressly or inherently teach such a system. Kreitzer teaches execution of a compare and skip operation as **determined by the hardware decoder**. Kreitzer is silent as to execution of the compare and skip operation by way of a programmable instruction. Thus, Kreitzer fails to expressly or inherently teach "wherein said processor executes a test and skip instruction **when called within the plurality of instructions**".

Based on the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1, and all claims which depend from claim 1 (claims 2-9), should be allowed.

B. Claim 10

Claim 10 stands rejected as allegedly anticipated by Toy. Applicants amend claim 10 to more clearly define over Toy's method of executing the test and skip operation. The amendment finds support in the original specification at Paragraphs [0017]-[0020], [0027] and Claim 10.

Toy teaches that the test and skip operation is always executed for **each even address** (Toy Col. 4, lines 49-50). Claim 10, by contrast, specifically recites, "A method of executing a test and skip instruction, comprising **calling the test and skip instruction within a sequence of instructions**". Applicants respectfully submit that Toy does not expressly or inherently teach such a system. Toy teaches execution of a test and skip operation at **each even address**. Toy is silent as to execution of the test and skip operation by way of a programmable instruction. Instead, Toy teaches that for **each**

**Serial No.: 10/632,084
Response to Office Action Dated December 14, 2005
Amendment Dated July 24, 2006**

instruction having an even address, the test and skip operation is always executed. Therefore, Toy fails to expressly or inherently teach "A method of executing a test and skip instruction, comprising **calling the test and skip instruction within a sequence of instructions**".

Claim 10 further stands rejected as allegedly anticipated by Kreitzer. Applicants amend claim 10 to more clearly define over Kreitzer's method of executing the test and skip operation. The amendment finds support in the original specification at Paragraphs [0017]-[0020], [0027] and Claim 10.

Kreitzer teaches execution of the compare and skip operation as **determined by the hardware decoder**. Claim 10, by contrast, specifically recites, "A method of executing a test and skip instruction, comprising **calling the test and skip instruction within a sequence of instructions**". Applicants respectfully submit that Kreitzer does not expressly or inherently teach such a system. Kreitzer teaches execution of a compare and skip operation as **determined by the hardware decoder**. Kreitzer is silent as to execution of the compare and skip operation by way of a programmable instruction. Thus, Kreitzer fails to expressly or inherently teach "A method of executing a test and skip instruction, comprising **calling the test and skip instruction within a sequence of instructions**".

Based on the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 10, and all claims which depend from claim 10 (claims 11-12), should be allowed.

C. Claim 13

Claim 13 stands rejected as allegedly anticipated by Toy. Applicants amend claim 13 to more clearly define over Toy's execution of the test and skip operation. The amendment finds support in the original specification at Paragraphs [0017]-[0020], [0027], and Claim 13.

Toy teaches that the test and skip operation is always executed for **each** even address (Toy Col. 4, lines 49-50). Claim 13, by contrast, specifically recites, "wherein said co-processor executes a test and skip instruction **when called within a sequence of instructions**". Applicants respectfully submit that Toy does not expressly or inherently teach such a system. Toy teaches execution of a test and skip operation at **each** even

**Serial No.: 10/632,084
Response to Office Action Dated December 14, 2005
Amendment Dated July 24, 2006**

address. Toy is silent as to execution of the test and skip operation by way of a programmable instruction. Instead, Toy teaches that for **each** instruction having an even address, the test and skip operation is always executed. Therefore, Toy fails to expressly or inherently teach "wherein said co-processor executes a test and skip instruction **when called within a sequence of instructions**".

Claim 13 further stands rejected as allegedly anticipated by Kreitzer. Applicants amend claim 13 to more clearly define over Kreitzer's execution of the test and skip operation. The amendment finds support in the original specification at Paragraphs [0017]-[0020], [0027], and Claim 13.

Kreitzer teaches execution of the compare and skip operation as **determined by the hardware decoder**. Claim 13, by contrast, specifically recites, "wherein said co-processor executes a test and skip instruction **when called within a sequence of instructions**". Applicants respectfully submit that Kreitzer does not expressly or inherently teach such a system. Kreitzer teaches execution of a compare and skip operation as **determined by the hardware decoder**. Kreitzer is silent as to execution of the compare and skip operation by way of a programmable instruction. Thus, Kreitzer fails to expressly or inherently teach "wherein said co-processor executes a test and skip instruction **when called within a sequence of instructions**".

Based on the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 13, and all claims which depend from claim 13 (claims 14-21), should be allowed.

D. Claim 22

Claim 22 stands rejected as allegedly anticipated by Toy. Applicants amend claim 22 to more clearly define over Toy's execution of the test and skip operation. The amendment finds support in the original specification at Paragraphs [0017]-[0020], [0027], and Claim 22.

Toy teaches that the test and skip operation is always executed for **each** even address (Toy Col. 4, lines 49-50). Claim 22, by contrast, specifically recites, "a means for executing a test and skip instruction **when called within a sequence of instructions**". Applicants respectfully submit that Toy does not expressly or inherently teach such a system. Toy teaches execution of a test and skip operation at **each** even address. Toy

**Serial No.: 10/632,084
Response to Office Action Dated December 14, 2005
Amendment Dated July 24, 2006**

is silent as to execution of the test and skip operation by way of a programmable instruction. Instead, Toy teaches that for each instruction having an even address, the test and skip operation is always executed. Therefore, Toy fails to expressly or inherently teach "a means for executing a test and skip instruction when called within a sequence of instructions".

Claim 22 further stands rejected as allegedly anticipated by Kreitzer. Applicants amend claim 22 to more clearly define over Kreitzer's execution of the test and skip operation. The amendment finds support in the original specification at Paragraphs [0017]-[0020], [0027], and Claim 22.

Kreitzer teaches execution of the compare and skip operation as determined by the hardware decoder. Claim 22, by contrast, specifically recites, "a means for executing a test and skip instruction when called within a sequence of instructions". Applicants respectfully submit that Kreitzer does not expressly or inherently teach such a system. Kreitzer teaches execution of a compare and skip operation as determined by the hardware decoder. Kreitzer is silent as to execution of the compare and skip operation by way of a programmable instruction. Thus, Kreitzer fails to expressly or inherently teach "a means for executing a test and skip instruction when called within a sequence of instructions".

Based on the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 22, and all claims which depend from claim 22 (claims 23-25), should be allowed. Applicants also amend claims 23-25 so that the preamble reads the same as the preamble for claim 22, which is the independent claim from which claims 23-25 depend.

V. CONCLUSION

In the course of the foregoing discussions, Applicants may have at times referred to claim limitations in shorthand fashion, or may have focused on a particular claim element. This discussion should not be interpreted to mean that the other limitations can be ignored or dismissed. The claims must be viewed as a whole, and each limitation of the claims must be considered when determining the patentability of the claims. Moreover, it should be understood that there may be other distinctions between the

**Serial No.: 10/632,084
Response to Office Action Dated December 14, 2005
Amendment Dated July 24, 2006**

claims and the cited art which have yet to be raised, but which may be raised in the future.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference would expedite the resolution of this case, he is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned. It is believed that no extensions of time or fees are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a), and any fees required (including fees for net addition of claims) are hereby authorized to be charged to the Texas Instruments, Inc. Deposit Account No. 20-0668.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael E. Ramon
PTO Reg. No. 52,147
CONLEY ROSE, P.C.
(512) 391-1900 (Phone)
(512) 320-9181 (Fax)
Agent for Applicants

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- BLACK BORDERS**
- IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES**
- FADED TEXT OR DRAWING**
- BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING**
- SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES**
- COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS**
- GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS**
- LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT**
- REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY**
- OTHER:** _____

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.